



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,678	04/05/2001	Grant C. Paton	8580.00	3514
26889	7590	06/24/2009	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL CHAN			CAMPEN, KELLY SCAGGS	
NCR CORPORATION				
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/826,678	PATON, GRANT C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KELLY CAMPEN	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8,10,21,23-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8,10,21,23-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

The following is in response to the amendments and remarks filed 3/16/2009. Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 21, 23-25, and 27-30. Claims 28-30 are newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 21, 23-25, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amendments filed 3/16/2009 to include specifics to an atm are not included in the originally filed specification. The background of the invention may have mentioned ATM technology by way of example for the background, but there is no mention in the detailed description, the figures, or the summary of the invention of an ATM. In addition, newly added claims 28 and 30 include a negative limitation with no wireless transmission, this is not enabled in the specification which appears to teach away from wired transmission and specifically is concerned with the wireless transmission.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,574,603, in view of Hayashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,631,313.

Claims 1, 8, Dickson discloses an in-vehicle ordering system and method comprising: locating the vehicle adjacent a transaction terminal (figure 1, #52, #14); transferring computer data from the transaction terminal to an in-car data entry facility maintained within the vehicle, which programs generate a user interface in the entry facility which facility is capable of handling some transaction with the atm without the transmitted programs, and acquires capability of handling additional transaction with the atm by using the programs, confirming the users id, transmitting the info to the user interface, transmitting to the atm response by the user to the info (column 16 lines 1-11, and column 18 lines 15-17, 28-40) entering user instructions into

the in-car data entry facility and transmitting the user instructions locally to the terminal for execution by the terminal (column 18 lines 41-61). Dickson fails to teach the data being transferred to the in-car data entry facility is a program.

Hayashi teaches a communication system for communication between in-vehicle terminals and a center, wherein a program is downloaded from a center to an in-vehicle terminal wirelessly (column 1 line 56 – column 2 line 6). As cited above, Dickson teaches transmitting the menu data to an in-vehicle controller from a transaction terminal. As admitted by Applicant in the Appeal Brief filed May 1, 2008, Dickson teaches “data which is fed to a pre-existing program in his IVC. That program determines what is displayed” (page 30). Examiner further notes that a program which, when run, determines what is displayed is equivalent to a program generating a display.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant’s invention to modify the teachings of Dickson to include transmitting this program from the terminal to the in-car data entry facility, as discussed in Hayashi. As in Hayashi, it is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art to wirelessly deploy an entire program to an in car computer with the predicted result of running whatever program is received as taught by Hayashi.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the in vehicle ordering system of Dickson the ability to transfer data to the in car data entry facility as a program as taught by Hayashi since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function

as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 2, Dickson teaches a step of identifying the user (transmitting identifying indicia - column 18 lines 56-59, column 19 lines 15-35).

Claim 3, Dickson teaches transmitting data locally from the terminal to the vehicle, and displaying a part of the data on an in-car display located within the vehicle (column 16 lines 1-11, and column 18 lines 15-17, 28-40).

Claim 10, Dickson teaches memory storage means for recording data (column 18 lines 23-35).

Claim 27, In addition to the citations provided with respect to claim 1, Dickson describes the intelligent vehicle controller being used in a variety of environments, Including a fuel dispenser, as well as a different quick service restaurants. While Dickson does not teach the act of locating the vehicle adjacent a second terminal, and receiving a second program, these different environments will inherently have different interfaces because the transactions being preformed are completely different. Furthermore, common sense dictates that different restaurants have different menus and different prices. Prices at the same restaurant in the same location may change. Even the same restaurant with the same menu may have different prices depending on location. All of these scenarios would result in a different interface being displayed to the user.

Specifically as to claim 28, in which the user instructions, data, and responses to user input, are not transmitted over a wireless communication network (design choice, see figure 1, #52, #14).

Specifically as to claim 29, in which the vehicle is situated at a known location with respect to the ATM (design choice, see figure 1, #52, #14).

Specifically as to claim 30, in which the programs are not transmitted over a wireless communication network (design choice, see figure 1, #52, #14).

Claims 21, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickson et al., in view of DeVries, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,547,133.

Claims 21, 23, 24, Dickson teaches maintaining a wireless communication device within a vehicle (figure 4B), positioning the vehicle near a terminal (figure #1, #52, #14), establishing wireless communication between the wireless device and the terminal (column 18 lines 41-51), identifying the user (transmitting identifying indicia - column 18 lines 56-59, column 19 lines 15-35), and completing a transaction upon verification (column 18 line 52 – column 19 line 35). Dickson fails to teach the terminal being an ATM machine, and entering identification data into the wireless device which allows the ATM to verify the identity of the user.

DeVries Jr. discloses a remote transaction interface system within a vehicle in which a user locates the vehicle within a proximity of a terminal, which may be a drive-through food service, or a bank teller machine, and uses a card reader device within the vehicle to enter bank card information, and a PIN number which identifies the user, in order to complete a financial transaction (column 5 line 31 – column 6 line 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Dickson to include the ATM features of DeVries Jr. because both Dickson and DeVries Jr. are disclosed as being used to order food at a quick service restaurant, and Dickson includes the claimed features necessary to operate an ATM, including a keypad and a card reader. The

inclusion of the ATM features into the system of Dickson would be desirable because the result would be an in car transaction device capable of performing more functions. Drive-up ATMs are old and well known in the art to be a popular transaction terminal used by drivers, and Dickson clearly intends the in-vehicle device to be diverse in its functions, because of the included support for many transactions which a driver commonly encounters.

Furthermore, the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Dickson and DeVries fail to teach transferring one or more computer programs from the terminal to the device. As cited above, Dickson teaches transferring data to be run on programs which are preexisting in the IVC.

Hayashi teaches a communication system for communication between in-vehicle terminals and a center, wherein a program is downloaded from a center to an in-vehicle terminal wirelessly (column 1 line 56 – column 2 line 6). The rational for the combination of Hayashi and Dickson is provided above, regarding claim 1. Furthermore, while Dickson fails to teach the terminal being an ATM, it would be obvious to modify the reference in view of DeVries Jr. to include an ATM, as disclosed above, regarding claim 21.

Furthermore, while Dickson, DeVries Jr., and Hayashi fail to teach inserting the car and entering a PIN both in response to a prompt issued by the interface, Official Notice is taken that an ATM machines have interfaces for interacting with users, and the interfaces issuing prompts

for a user to enter a card and to enter a PIN is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Dickson, DeVries Jr., and Hayashi to include the prompting because ATMs are designed to be user-friendly, and providing instructions on how to operate the machine increases the usability

Claim 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickson and DeVries, Jr., as applied above, and further in view of Hayashi.

Dickson and DeVries fail to teach transferring one or more computer programs from the terminal to the device. As cited above, Dickson teaches transferring data to be run on programs which are preexisting in the IVC.

Hayashi teaches a communication system for communication between in-vehicle terminals and a center, wherein a program is downloaded from a center to an in-vehicle terminal wirelessly (column 1 line 56 – column 2 line 6). The rational for the combination of Hayashi and Dickson is provided above, regarding claim 1. Furthermore, while Dickson fails to teach the terminal being an ATM, it would be obvious to modify the reference in view of DeVries Jr. to include an ATM, as disclosed above, regarding claim 21.

Furthermore, while Dickson, DeVries Jr., and Hayashi fail to teach inserting the card and entering a PIN both in response to a prompt issued by the interface, Official Notice is taken that an ATM machines have interfaces for interacting with users, and the interfaces issuing prompts for a user to enter a card and to enter a PIN is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the

teachings of Dickson, DeVries Jr., and Hayashi to include the prompting because ATMs are designed to be user-friendly, and providing instructions on how to operate the machine increases the usability

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickson, DeVries, Jr., and Hayashi et al., as applied to claims 21 and 25 above, and further in view of Ohki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,952,639.

Dickson, DeVries, and Hayashi fail to teach uploading electronic valuable media to a memory storage device, and downloading electronic valuable media to a terminal from a memory storage device.

Ohki discloses a system and method for depositing and withdrawing electronic money between and ATM and an IC card (figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Dickson, DeVries, and Hayashi to include the electronic money transfer of Ohki because DeVries teaches interaction with an ATM, and Dickson teaches the device within the vehicle including a smart card reader (column 10 lines 20-31). Although Dickson fails to teach how the smart card reader is used, it is old and well known in the art that smart cards are commonly used to store electronic money, as a convenient method for completing transactions.

Specifically as to claim 28, in which the user instructions, data, and responses to user input, are not transmitted over a wireless communication network (design choice, see figure 1, #52, #14).

Specifically as to claim 29, in which the vehicle is situated at a known location with respect to the ATM (design choice, see figure 1, #52, #14).

Specifically as to claim 30, in which the programs are not transmitted over a wireless communication network (design choice, see figure 1, #52, #14).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 10, 21-25, and 27, have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

With regards to applicant's arguments that the use of "anywhere" is not the same as adjacent, Examiner disagrees. The term "adjacent" is within the scope of "anywhere".

Applicant's arguments filed 3/16/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that (see various "points" made by applicant on pages 8-24), the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Further, it is clear that the applicant has not argued that the Dickson reference was lacking and as such, it is now admitted prior art on the record as Applicant did not traverse the Examiner's findings as such.

Since applicant did not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice, the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice. Therefore the statement is made final. To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention **without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate**. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KELLY CAMPEN whose telephone number is (571)272-6740. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kelly Campen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691